

**REMARKS**

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the February 6, 2008 Final Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment B amends claims 1, 9, 11, 17, 18 and 22. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-22 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112*

Claims 1-16 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office argues that amended claims 1, 9, 11, 18, and 22 include limitations that are not disclosed by the specification in paragraphs [0040] and [0050-51]. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, 11, 18 and 22 to correct the limitation of the amended claims by reciting “denying the user if the comparing indicates that the user certificate data matches the revoked certificate data ....” Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102*

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Pub. No. 20020004773 to Xu et al. Applicants respectfully submit that Xu fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 17. Applicants will address this rejection below in conjunction with the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

*Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103*

Claims 1-16 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu in view of US Pat. Pub. No. 20030097592 to Adusumilli. Applicants respectfully submit that the combined references of Xu and Adusumilli fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that Xu attempts to solve a different technical problem by using "different CRL retrieval agents for different CRL distribution methods to consolidate

CRLs from multiple CAs into a central CRL database, **which can be replicated to other machines via network.**" Xu, paragraph [0012] (emphasis added). In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that the Xu, as well as in combination of Adusumilli, fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the amended independent claims. In particular, nowhere do the combined references of Xu and Adusumilli disclose or suggest each and every element below:

if the determining indicates that the received user certificate data has not expired:  
    comparing the user certificate data included in the received request to the revoked certificate data stored in the central location;  
        if the comparing indicates that the user certificate data from the requested user certificate matches one of the revoked certificate data stored in the central location, denying the user access to the secure web service;  
        if the comparing indicates that the user certificate data from the requested user certificate does not match the revoked certificate data stored in the central location,  
        determining if the update to one of the revoked certificates is available based on the next update time;  
            if the determining indicates that no update is available,  
    authenticating the user to access the secured web service;  
        if the determining indicates that the update is available, retrieving the update from the address;  
            in response to the retrieved update, storing the update to one of the revoked certificates in the central location;  
                if the comparing indicates that the user certificate data matches the updated revoked certificate data in the central location, denying the user access to the secure web service;  
                if the comparing indicates that the user certificate data does not match one of the updated revoked certificate data in the central location:  
                    authenticating the user;  
                    providing the user access to the requested web service;  
                    detecting an event including a new entry in the central location, a current time equals to the next update time of one of the revoked certificate data or the current time equals to the next update time of one of the updated revoked certificate data; and  
                    in response to the detected event, retrieving another update of one of the revoked certificate in the central location.

See also paragraphs [0053-54] and FIGS. 6-7 for support of the amendments). In other words, while both Xu and Adusumilli disclose some means for retrieving the CRL, storing the revoked certificates and updating the revoked certificates, the combined references of Xu and Adusumilli fail to disclose or suggest the update is triggered by and in response to the active process of verifying the user request. In other words, the combined references of Xu and Adusumilli teach away from embodiments of the invention by attempting to retrieve update

periodically and before the user request is processed and **not** during the user request is processed. See also Adusumilli, paragraphs [0156] and [0170]. Furthermore, nowhere do the combined references of Xu and Adusumilli disclose or suggest at least the features of "organizing the retrieved revoked certificate data in a sequence according to the determined update time for each of the one or more certificate issuers" as recited in claims 9 and 22.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined references of Xu and Adusumilli fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 1. Independent claims 9, 11, 17, 18 and 22 have been amended to also clarify the distinction over the prior art. Hence, the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and the rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-22 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

**Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/TAN-CHI YUAN/

Tan-Chi Yuan, Limited Recognition No. L0113  
SENNIGER POWERS

Serial No. 10/817,246

16

MS#307521.01 (5107)

One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 231-5400

FRA/ATY/